

Kern and the Study of Indian Buddhism*

With a Speculative Note on the Ceylonese Dhammarucikas

Isaline Blew Horner was born March 30, 1896, the very year of the publication of Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern's *Manual of Indian Buddhism* in Georg Bühler's series *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*; as far as I know, however, these two facts are entirely unrelated, and Miss Horner did not develop her interest in Buddhism, apparently, until 1921, during a trip through Sri Lanka, Burma and India, this coming some four years after the death of Kern, who was born April 6, 1833, and died July 4, 1917.

The name of Hendrik Kern is certainly well known still today, a century after his floruit, primarily through his *Manual*, which is still being reprinted, and through his *editio princeps* of the Lotus Sutra in Sanskrit, edited between 1908–1912 with Bunyiu Nanjio and usually simply termed “Kern–Nanjio”. Moreover, his 1884 English translation of the same text, prepared for Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East, is still the only version in English rendered from Sanskrit (or, as we used to say, “the original Sanskrit”). This is surely more than enough to establish Kern's position as one of the leading figures in the Western study of Indian — one might rather say these days, South Asian — Buddhism. But Kern also published extensive remarks on the Pāli language, both his 1886 “Bijdrage tot de verklaring van eenige woorden in Pāli-geschriften voorkomende”, or “Contribution to the Explanation of Some Words Occurring in Pāli Writings”, and his 1916 “Toevoegselen op 't woordenboek van Childers”, “Supplements to the dictionary of Childers”, two major studies à propos the pioneering dictionary of Pāli published between 1872 and 1875 by Robert Cæsar Childers. The latter of these supplements at least is certainly referred to many times in the

*This article is a revised version of the paper read as the thirteenth I.B. Horner Memorial Lecture, delivered in London on 18 September 2009 at the annual general meeting of the Pali Text Society.

Pali Text Society's *Pāli-English Dictionary*, although not always approvingly. In addition, Kern published several studies on Aśokan inscriptions in 1873, 1876, and 1880,¹ and the *editio princeps* of the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra, published in 1891 as the very first volume of the Harvard Oriental Series. This edition, incidentally, is still spoken of highly by Albrecht Hanisch in his recent philological notes on the poem.²

The tome that was, at least at the time of its publication, considered Kern's masterwork, however, is relatively little known today, that being his massive *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië* or "History of Buddhism in India", published in two volumes in Haarlem in 1881–1883.³ A translation under Kern's supervision was begun by Georges François Guillaume Jean Jacques Collins in French in 1881 in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, continued by Charles Michel, but given up after part one.⁴ Both volumes were translated virtually immediately into German by Hermann Jacobi in 1882–1884 as *Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien* (where Hendrik becomes Heinrich). The complete work was later translated into French by Gédéon Busken Huet in 1901–1903 as *Histoire du bouddhisme dans l'Inde* and published in the important series *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes*. These volumes have never appeared in English. Kern's shorter *Manual*, it is interesting to note, was translated into Japanese as early as 1914 by

¹For the convenience of most readers, it might be best to cite the abbreviated English translations of the Dutch contributions, namely Kern 1874b, 1876, 1877. Originally in English was Kern 1880. Regarding the first listed item, see also A. Barth's review from 1874, reprinted in Barth, 1917: 126–39.

²Hanisch, 2005: I.xxiv ff.

³It appears that the first volume of the work was actually first published in 1881 by A. C. Kruseman in Haarlem, but my copy is rather printed in Haarlem by Tjeenk Willink in 1882 and 1884.

⁴"Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde", *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 4 (1881): 149–65, 5 (1882): 49–88, 145–226, by Collins, continued from p. 34 of the last installment by Michel, 7 (1883): 17–62.

Tachibana Shundō 立花俊道 as *Bukkyō Taikō* 佛教大綱, an effort assisted by the very same Nanjio Bunyiu (Nanjō Bunyū 南条文雄) mentioned above; they received assistance with technical vocabulary from none other than the young Otto Rosenberg, in his early twenties and at that time a student in Japan. It would be interesting to investigate just what sort of an impact Kern's work had in those early days on Japanese Buddhist Studies, and a scholar with good access to Japanese libraries should undertake such a study. Finally, it is important to mention that Kern devoted considerable attention to Khmer and Javanese sources, especially inscriptions, contributing *inter alia* to the study of Buddhist-Śaiva syncretism, though these studies stand outside the scope of the discussion here.⁵

In the following, I offer a few remarks on Kern and his contributions to the study of South Asian Buddhism, followed by an experiment in what might be called the tradition of Kern. First, however, I confess a failure in what I had hoped to be able to achieve. Kern was Professor in Leiden University. Being myself now in Leiden, I hoped that it would be possible to discover among the papers of Kern what I thought must

⁵In this respect however it might be helpful to draw attention to a paper translated by Louis de la Vallée Poussin into French, "Sur l'Invocation d'une Inscription bouddhique de Battambang", *Le Muséon* (new series) 7 (1906): 46–66. This (and its Dutch original, which appeared in 1899) was overlooked by Johannes Bronkhorst, "Hendrik Kern and the Body of the Buddha", *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 63/1 (2009): 7–27, although this in no way affects his argument. Kern's article devotes considerable attention to a verse which reads: *namo stu paramāṛthāya vyomakalpāya yo dadhau | dharma-sambhogi-nirmāṇa-kāyā[ms] trailokyamuktaye*, "Hommage à la suprême vérité, semblable à l'espace vide, qui pour délivrer le triple monde, a pris un Dharmakāya, un Sambhogikāya, un Nirmāṇakāya!" It must be confessed that Kern's understanding of the theory in question is a bit odd, to say the least. Two other studies of inscriptions have been translated into English by Uli Kozok and Eric van Reijn, "The Sanskrit-Inscription of King Āditya-warman at Kubu Rajo (Minangkabau; ±1300 Śāka)", and "The Inscription Commemorating the Consecration of the Amoghapāśa Statue of Padang Candi (Central Sumatra); 1269 Śāka", both to be found at <http://ulikozok.com/>.

exist somewhere, namely the correspondence between Kern and Nanjō which led to their joint edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. For these two scholars, though they never met,⁶ managed, as many did before the age of jets and email, nevertheless to bring to fruition a major scholarly project using the resources of the post. Most unfortunately, whatever records of this correspondence once existed are no more. From Kern's side, Hanna 't Hart, who researched Kern some years ago, wrote to me as follows:⁷

The story of Kern's papers (and books) is a sad one. I was told that one of his sons was working for Martinus Nijhoff, antiquarian booksellers in the Hague. As the papers were supposed to be of no antiquarian value at the time, he is said to have chucked them away. He was just keen on selling the books. In this way, from Kern's own collections no books and no letters came to any public collection.... The scanty bit that is at the Kern Institute was collected by Prof. [Jean Philippe] Vogel when he started the institute in the 1920s. I remember having read letters by Vogel to colleagues, begging for Kern's letters. In this way he was lucky to have received Kern's letters that Caland kept carefully; of course, Caland's side of the correspondence is also gone. This was the situation I found out while working on my article on Kern's life.

The Japanese side of the situation is equally sad. Robert Rhodes of Ōtani University wrote to me that "Nanjō was born in Gifu but married into the Nanjō family temple in Fukui.... Apparently, while he was

⁶Nanjō was in England from 1876 until 1884. Although he, accompanying Max Müller, attended the fifth International Congress of Orientalists held in 1881 in Berlin, Kern did not. See the *Verhandlungen des fünften Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses gehalten zu Berlin im September 1881* (Berlin: A. Asher & Co. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1881): I.8 (for Dutch participants, where Kern's name does not appear) and 10 (where we find "Bunyu Nanjio, aus Japan, derzeit in Oxford, England"). The fact is made completely clear since in his recollections, *Kaikyūroku* 懷舊録 (Tokyo: Daiyūkaku shobō 大雄閣書房, 1927): 346 (reprinted in the Tōyō Bunko series 東洋文庫 359 [Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1979: 291]), Nanjō expresses his regret that he and Kern never met.

⁷Email 10 Feb. 2010. See 't Hart 1989.

alive, Nanjō took all of the documents that were at the temple to Tokyo”.⁸ This unfortunately took place not very long before 1923, and Nanjō himself died in 1927. We must conclude, then, that all Nanjō’s papers were destroyed in the disastrous Kanto earthquake of 1923, as likewise no papers are to be found in Ōtani University in Kyoto, where Nanjō taught and was president for many years. In the absence of other materials, whatever we may say about Kern and his working methods must be derived from the internal evidence of his publications themselves.

Let us turn, then, to Kern and the study of South Asian Buddhism in general, that is, Kern and the Buddhism of India and Sri Lanka. I think it important to concentrate on what we might still learn from Kern, rather than emphasizing only his impact in his time, or on the other hand in registering those instances in which, from our self-defined “superior” point of view today, we see he went wrong. For while he did go wrong here and there — and I suspect that the pioneers probably went wrong, percentage-wise, quite a bit less than many of their modern critics — there is also still much to learn from Kern.

Not all would necessarily agree. Speaking in a context broader than simply his Buddhist studies, Hanna ’t Hart wrote that “Kern’s importance in the fields he chose to work in goes far beyond the small number of his books still used today. It is clear that his real importance lies in his own time and in the stage scholarship had reached then”.⁹ Although her considerations take account of Kern’s contributions not only to Indian Studies but also to Dutch language and dialects, Indo-European, Malay-Polynesian, and ancient Java, I find them too pessimistic. For even setting aside entirely his Buddhist studies, Kern edited and translated an important astronomical text, the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira,¹⁰ edited the astrological work *Āryabhaṭīya*,¹¹ and pub-

⁸Email 17 Sept. 2009.

⁹See note 7 above.

¹⁰Kern 1865. His translation is 1870–1875. He edited another work of the same author as well, 1868–1878.

lished numerous pioneering and still important works on Kawi or Old Javanese, works which continue to be used, and even standard, today. I believe, therefore, that it is not quite justified to speak of Kern as being of mere historical significance.

I will not go into detail about what Kern had to say about Pāli. But of course, it would not do to ignore it entirely. For, from very early on, Kern was concerned with the nature of Pāli and its historical situation, and the relation between the language of Aśoka, the language of the Pāli scriptures, and what he calls in Dutch the “basterd-Sanskrit” of the northern Buddhists, what we dryly term “hybrid Sanskrit”. He wrote in 1873:¹² “For those persons who wrote in hybrid Sanskrit and in Pāli, neither was any longer living. They wrote in a largely artificial language (*kunstmatige taal*), which was no longer subject to the beneficial check of the spoken language. Only this explains how so many incomprehensible words and forms appear in Pāli and hybrid Sanskrit, mistakes of such a type as learned people can commit, but which never appear in the wildest folk-language.” Kern considers it impossible that Pāli is Māgadhī, that is, that Pāli is the oldest form of Buddhist language.

He continued to be interested in this issue, and once again in the introduction to his English translation of the Lotus Sutra in 1884, Kern was concerned about problems of language. Perhaps surprisingly, given that he is prefacing a translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, he devotes a number of pages of his introduction instead to parallels between the Lalitavistara and the Pāli Mahāvagga. These parallels he cites, he says, “to prove that the material of a Mahāvaipulya Sūtra is partly as old as that of any other sacred book of the Buddhists”.¹³ At the same time, when Kern turns to the Lotus in his introduction, he asserts the following:¹⁴

¹¹Kern 1874a.

¹²Kern 1873: 14–15.

¹³Kern 1884: xiv.

¹⁴p. xix.

The Gāthās of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka are nowhere very brilliant, but in some chapters they are so excessively clumsy and mechanically put together that involuntarily we are led to the assumption of their having been made by persons to whom the old dialect was no longer familiar.

While perhaps not for the same reasons, I agree with Kern here, and moreover, I think this scenario is likely to be the case not only for the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka but likewise for at least some other earlier Mahāyāna scriptures, such as the Kāśyapaparivarta. In my yet unpublished lecture presented in Kyoto at the World Sanskrit Conference in 2009, I argued that the verses of the Kāśyapaparivarta, which are demonstrably later than its prose, were composed by an author to whom, as Kern has put it, “the old dialect was no longer familiar”. Given that the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is undoubtedly the most studied of Mahāyāna sūtras — although I would quickly say, from the point of view of Indian Buddhism, certainly not the most representative or important — it is a bit sobering to find that we must also agree with the following assessment offered by Kern in 1884:¹⁵

At present we are far from the ultimate end which critical research has to reach; we are not able to assign to each part of our Sūtra its proper place in the development of Buddhist literature. We may feel that compositions from different times have been collected into a not very harmonious whole; we may even be able to prove that some passages are as decidedly ancient as others are modern, but any attempt to analyse the compound and lay bare its component parts would seem to be premature. Under these circumstances the inquiry after the date of the work resolves itself into the question at what time the book received its present shape.

Many scholars today would not characterize their obsession as one of determining the exact date of a work. Still, one contemporary trend is very much concerned with seeking to understand the origins and development of Mahāyāna sūtra literature, and this is precisely what Kern too was thinking about. It is, from this point of view, not neces-

¹⁵p. xx.

sarily encouraging to find that we have not made perhaps quite as much progress since his day as we might like to expect.

After translating the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* on the basis of two Nepalese manuscripts in 1884, in the years 1908–1912 Kern published an edition of the text, still the standard. He did not, of course, do this alone, and he has been rather harshly criticized for the way in which he edited the Sanskrit provided largely by his co-editor. In particular, he has been taken to task for adding to the edition prepared by Nanjō on the basis of six Nepalese manuscripts readings from what is now generally known as the Kashgar manuscript (which Kern called ‘O’). J.W. de Jong referred to the result as “neither flesh nor fish”.¹⁶ In speaking of this some ten years ago, Tilmann Vetter credits Willy Baruch in a publication of 1938 with “discover[ing] that variant readings had often been ignored or inaccurately referred to”.¹⁷ This is one thing, and one certainly expects from any editor that he or she reads and reports the sources correctly. But this is not what de Jong was talking about. In fact, as early as 1916, Rudolf Hoernle pointed out in an editorial note to Heinrich Lüders’s edition of Central Asian fragments of the sūtra in his *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* that “the Bibliotheca Buddhica print does not present a pure Nepalese text, but incorporates a number of Eastern Turkestani readings”.¹⁸ If this were so, if the edition really conflated distinct recensions, this would indeed be problematic. But the matter appears to be a bit more complex. In this regard, Vetter’s discovery on the basis of his careful analysis is very important. According to Vetter:¹⁹

Kern does in fact keep apart the two recensions.... [I]n Kern’s footnotes normally all passages are ignored that are characteristic of the Kashgar manuscript as described by himself in an Additional Note to Nanjō’s

¹⁶de Jong 1997: 54 [originally in *The Eastern Buddhist* 7/2 (1974): 55].

¹⁷Vetter 1999: 10, referring to Baruch 1938: 7–12.

¹⁸In his note to Lüders 1916: 143–44.

¹⁹pp. 11–12.

Preface.... In the footnotes only those Kashgar readings appear that are close alternatives of a word in the text. And in the text itself only those Kashgar readings have been adopted that seemed to be the original or only correct ones. Such adoptions — and Kern's sporadic emendations — can always be questioned, but this is not mixing up recensions. They depend on the assumption that transmission can create readings nobody had intended, especially when reciting and copying a text without understanding came to prevail. Such readings should be removed from any edition that pretends to establish an early state of a text.

Vetter's point is that if one accepts the idea of an archetype or hyparchetype lying behind diverse sources, it is not only possible for an editor, but indeed the editor's basic responsibility, in line with Classical text-critical ideas, to establish as far as possible the original from which the witnesses, due to the vagaries of scribes, have wandered. Kern certainly held the idea, as did every text critic in his day, that the goal of an editor was the establishment of *the original* text. Therefore, Vetter's observations here are very important, and resonate well with what we know of Kern's general approach also from his study of Pāli, the Lalitavistara and Aśokan inscriptions. Kern was very concerned to make sense of the interplay of Sanskrit, Pāli and what he along with others sometimes called the Gāthā dialect (although I still prefer his Dutch "basterd-Sanskrit"). More careful attention would have to be given the matter than is possible here to establish how Kern's editorial choices in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka edition fit in with what he has to say elsewhere about Buddhist Middle Indic. But I think one thing should be clear: Kern did not thoughtlessly "correct", which is to say *conflate*, the Nepalese text prepared by Nanjō with readings from the Kashagar manuscript. Rather, it appears that, having thought carefully about the forms underlying the variants available to him, he strove to establish something as close as possible to what he considered to be *the original* Indic shape of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. Or at least he did so within reason, for I have not mentioned his idea that the sūtra originally consisted entirely of verses, and needless to say, he did not dare to prune the prose from the received text. This idea of a purely verse core (or

kern!) today would find few adherents, and Kern's reasons for believing this seem to me not entirely solid. Still, not only in his day, but even today, it is not an idea that should be considered, *prima facie*, ridiculous, and the question of just how Mahāyāna sūtras developed remains every bit as open today as it was in Kern's time.

The other major work Kern contributed to the study of Indian Buddhism from a textual point of view is his edition of Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā*. While recent work on this text by, most notably, Peter Khoroché²⁰ and Albrecht Hanisch finds numerous instances in which Kern's text can be corrected and improved, there is no denying that he took a sometimes difficult text and on the basis of often not very good manuscript evidence produced an edition which has served well for many years. It is worth noting that for decades the standard translation of the text was that of Kern's student and successor Jacob Samuel Speyer.²¹ Finally, I leave aside here, as outside the scope of this discussion, consideration of Kern's contributions to Buddhist and Buddhō-Śaiva inscriptions and other Southeast Asian and Javanese matters, which should be discussed by specialists.

Instead, as promised, or threatened, in addition to this brief consideration of the work of Kern, I would also attempt a bit of speculation in his tradition. In his monumental *History of Indian Buddhism*, Kern sometimes gave wing to ideas or associations that might seem a bit more impressionistic than solidly grounded. Some of these ideas were no doubt far over the top, but I am not convinced that *all* are worthy of the rubbish heap. Some indeed demonstrate a willingness to imaginatively engage the materials that is rather rare today among textual scholars (and rather too rife among those without firsthand familiarity with primary sources, one might add). In this spirit,

²⁰Khoroché 1987.

²¹First published as a series of articles, 1893–1894, followed in revised form by a book in 1895, volume I of the series *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*. This text thus inaugurated both the Harvard Oriental Series and the *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*.

in the following I dare to offer a few thoughts on the topic of the Dhammarucikas of Ceylon, touched upon several times by Kern, albeit in passing, and mostly on the basis, it seems, of a single remark by George Turnour in the preface to his edition and translation of the *Mahāvamsa*.²² In this context, Kern refers to the origins of the schismatic Dhammarucikas, though without offering any speculations. Since, however, elsewhere he shows himself willing to interpret, for instance, the significance of names, I take inspiration from that model in the following. To quote a relevant example, in speaking of the schismatic Mahādeva (to be introduced below), Kern wrote:²³

Although the legend that we have just summarized may be far from clear, it is nevertheless known however that Mahādeva and Bhadra are names of Śiva who, in his capacity as the god of Time, may be called the Genie of destruction.... When one considers the diversity of the nature of Śiva, one is not astonished that the southern Mahādeva plays an entirely different role from that of the heretic master.

It is in this spirit of, one might say, somewhat free association that I offer the following remarks.

A number of Ceylonese sources speak of a sect called Dhammarucika, the historical existence of which cannot be doubted.²⁴ Likewise, its identification with the “heterodox” Abhayagiri-vihāra, opponents of the “orthodox” Mahāvihāra, is well established.²⁵ These two, the Mahāvihāra and Abhayagiri-vihāra, are the major sub-schools of Ceylonese Theravāda, and traditionally strongly opposed each other. Ultimately, the Mahāvihāra prevailed, and consequently most Ceylonese Buddhist history transmitted until today reflects the Mahāvihāra standpoint. The

²²Turnour 1836: ci–cii. See Kern 1881–1883: II.337, 375.

²³Kern 1881–1883: II.292–93.

²⁴It is mentioned, for instance, not only in the *Mahāvamsa* and *Cūlavamsa*, but in tenth–eleventh-century inscriptions as well, as noted by Adikaram 1946: 94 and Gunawardana 1979: 17.

²⁵On the Abhayagirivāsins, see Bareau 1955: 241–43, and now from another perspective the critical remarks in Crosby 1999.

Dhammarucikas were said to be followers of a Vajjiputta sect teacher named Dhammaruci, hence their name. While the historicity of the Abhayagiri–Mahāvihāra schism, the first in Ceylonese Buddhism, is certain, any possible actual role or historically factual connection therein of a monk called Dhammaruci is of less interest than the fact that later (Mahāvihāra) Ceylonese tradition explicitly connects objectionable and schismatic doctrines with an individual of precisely this name.²⁶ It is upon this point that I wish to concentrate by exploring several facets of the relation between Dhammaruci and the Abhayagiri–Mahāvihāra schism. In particular, I would like to propose an *affective connection* with narratives of the so-called fundamental schism in the Buddhist Church, that between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas.

This schism, as is well known, is blamed by the Sarvāstivādin *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā on a nasty monk named Mahādeva, one of several with the same name referred to by Kern, who after committing three of the five sins of immediate retribution, killing his father and mother and an arhat, entered the monastic community, and eventually set forth five heretical theses critical of the status of an arhat, the *pañca-vastūni*. Pāli sources also are aware of a schism, but relate it instead to ten points upheld by the Vajjiputta sect monks, the same group to which Dhammaruci is said to have belonged.²⁷ We also recall here that the

²⁶Obeyesekere 1990: 174–80, 186 studies the Sinhala king Kāśyapa I, a supporter of the Dhammarucikas (Mahāvamsa 39.15; Cūlavamsa trans. i.44), who had arranged the murder of his own father Dhūtasena (Mahāvamsa 38.105; Cūlavamsa trans. i.40). However, Obeyesekere’s reason for associating the two notices (“it is probably no accident that Kāśyapa supported the Dhammaruci sect, a Buddhist school influenced by Mahāyāna, possessing a more liberal soteriology and perhaps a path of atonement through penance”) cannot be accepted, above all since we really know next to nothing about Dhammarucika ideas in general, not to mention their soteriology in particular.

²⁷There are of course a number of studies of these ten points, but what is relevant here is their attribution in the sources to the Vajjiputtakas; see Cullavagga xii.1.1.

schismatic followers of the Buddha's nemesis Devadatta are called Vajjiputtakā in the Pāli Vinaya.²⁸

Despite the confidence with which some writers approach the topic, we do not know much factual about the Dhammarucikas, and it is only in somewhat later Ceylonese sources that we get certain details. Thus, while the perhaps fifth-century Mahāvamsa knows the Dhammarucika school,²⁹ it is only its commentary the Mahāvamsa-tīkā, which may date three or four centuries later,³⁰ that identifies these Dhammarucikas with the Abhayagiri monks in an explicit fashion.³¹ Likewise, the story of the founding of the schismatic Abhayagiri order in the Mahāvamsa itself does not mention the Dhammarucika.³²

Our most detailed source for the Dhammarucikas is a late fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century work in Singhalese, the Nikāya-saṃgrahawa (Compendium of the Sects), the reliability of which is often in question.³³ This source, however, whether historically reliable or not, certainly reflects some orthodox Mahāvihārin ideas of the period

The evil of the Vajjiputtakas is detailed in the Dīpavaṃsa vv. 30–38 (Oldenberg 1879). The text goes on in v. 39 to say explicitly that many later schismatic groups (*bhinnavādā*) arose from the results of that early split, namely from the Mahāsāṃghika order.

²⁸Cullavagga vii.4.1. Non-Ceylonese sources tend to associate a monk named Vātsīputra — the Sanskrit equivalent of Pāli Vajjiputta — with activities two hundred years after the death of the Buddha, and in their accounting sixty-three years after the split which led to the creation of the Mahāsāṃghika. (The phonological relation between the Pāli and Sanskrit forms is problematic, since Pāli Vajji° should reflect Sanskrit Vṛji. I do not know that the problem has been satisfactorily addressed.)

²⁹At v. 13.

³⁰See von Hinüber 1996: §188, p. 92.

³¹Malalasekera 1935: 175.26: *Dhammarucikā ti ime Abhayagirivāsino bhikkhū*.

³²At xxxiii.97. See Malalasekera 1935: 676.24, ad xxxvii.3–4.

³³See Mori 1999: 11–12.

in which it was composed.³⁴ Since I am less interested in “history” than in perceptions of the past, the evidence of the Nikāyasaṃgrahawa cannot be ignored. This text says the following:³⁵

Then, the Great-Elder (*mahāthera*) Tissa, who was [first] living in Kemgalle and [later] had accepted the Bhagiri (/Abhayagiri) monastery [as a gift from King Vaṭṭa-gāmaṇī-abhaya], was [heard to be] having close association with lay-families [which is inappropriate for a monk]. Thereupon the pious monks of the “Great-Monastery” assembled and were imposing the legal act [of the punishment] of banishing (*pabbājaniya-kammaya: sic*) him [practically speaking, expelling him from the community until he mends his ways] when one of his pupils, who was in the assembly, by name Mahadāliya-tissa, obstructed them, saying “Please do not treat our venerable Great-Elder in this way.” But then the monks pronounced the legal act [of the punishment] of suspension [depriving him of his right to associate with the community as a whole, until he makes amends] (*utkṣepaniya-kammaya: sic*) on him for complying with/following the wrong-doer/doing.

He then, burning with anger, left the Theriya fraternity (*nikāya*) taking about five hundred monks with him, and lived at the Abhayagiri monastery. While he was staying there, the disciples of the Master Dharmaruci of the Vajjiputra fraternity mentioned before, who came to this country from Pallarārāma in India, approached him; [consequently] he took to their doctrine/belief and joined them (in their community), and settled down as the Master Dharmaruci. Since that period those who belonged to Abhayagiri came to be known as the Dharmaruci fraternity.

Thus a fraternity called Dharmaruci that broke away from the Theriya fraternity was [eventually] established in Bhagiri monastery in the fifteenth

³⁴For examples of the use of this source see Ayerton 1924: 15–17, Malalasekera 1938: i.1147–48, and so on repeatedly in later studies. Systematic comparisons of some passages in the Nikāyasaṃgrahawa with the Dīpa-, Mahā- and Cūla-vamsas are found in Mori 1999: 11–33. Note that most scholars (myself included) make use of the English translation of Fernando 1908; perhaps a fresh examination of the Sinhala original would not be without profit (see the next note).

³⁵Fernando 1908: 11–12. The translation has been emended in light of the original Sinhala text by Dr. Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi of the University of Heidelberg. I am deeply grateful for his assistance.

year of the reign Vaḷagamabhā and 454 years after the demise of the Buddha....

In the days of this king [Vyavahāratissa, 752 years after the demise of the Buddha] the residents of [the monastery of] Abhayagiri with the name of Dharmaruci accepted the Vaitulya Piṭaka, which was called Vaitulya by certain non-Buddhist Brahmins who had assumed the garb of monks for the purpose of destroying the Buddhist Teaching/Order (*śāsana*), had composed it in the times of the above-mentioned Great-king Dharmāśoka, and had proclaimed it as the “teachings of the Buddha”. Thereupon the monks of the Theriya fraternity compared it with the “doctrine and discipline” (*dharma-vinaya*) [of the Buddha] and rejected the teaching of the Vaitulya as being opposed to the [true] teaching [of the Buddha].

The text goes on to offer several other examples of the continued evil influences of the Dhammarucikas, including a reference to “sinful, evil-practicing priests of the ... Dharmaruṇi ... who by their evil practices stain the purity of the Buddhist religion ...”.³⁶

I cannot pretend that I can solve the historical problem of the real identity of these Dhammarucikas, nor can I clearly trace their antecedents. What I can do, however, is offer a scenario which suggests that the name may have carried with it nuances and implications which made it an apt label for schismatics.

The name Dhammaruci, or its Sanskrit equivalent Dharmaruci, appears in a rather wide variety of Buddhist literature, even in Theravāda Sri Lanka. The Pāli Apadāna (Stories) contains the story of a Dhammaruci, who in a past life was a rather unpleasant fellow:³⁷

tadāhaṃ māṇavo āsiṃ Megho nāma susikkhito |
 sutvā vyākaraṇaṃ seṭṭhaṃ Sumedhassa mahāmune |
 saṃvissattho³⁸ bhavitvāna Sumedhe karuṇāsaye |
 pabbajantaṃ ca taṃ vīraṃ sah’ eva anuppabbajim |
 saṃvuto pāṭimokkhasmiṃ indriyesu ca pañcasu |
 suddhājīvo sato vīro Jinasāsanakārako |

³⁶Fernando 1908: 22.

³⁷For details see Appendix I: The Apadāna.

³⁸This word is Sanskrit *saṃviśvasta*, on which see Edgerton 1953, s.v.

evaṃ viharamāno 'haṃ pāpamittena kenaci |
 niyojito anācāre sumaggā paridhaṃsito |
 vitakkavasiko hutvā sāsanato apakkamiṃ |
 pacchā tena kumittena payutto mātughātaṇaṃ |
 akariṃ anantariyaṃ ca ghātayaṃ duṭṭhamānaso |
 tato cuto Mahāvīciṃ upapanno sudāruṇaṃ |
 vinipātagato santo saṃsariṃ dukkhito ciraṃ |
 na puno addasaṃ vīraṃ Sumedhaṃ narapuṅgavaṃ |
 asmiṃ kappe samuddamhi maccho āsiṃ timiṅgalo |
 disvāhaṃ sāgare nāvaṃ gocarattham upāgamiṃ |
 disvā maṃ vāṇijā bhītā buddhaseṭṭhaṃ anussaruṃ |
 Gotamo ti mahāghosaṃ sutvā tehi udīritaṃ |
 pubbasaññaṃ saritvāna tato kālaṅkato ahaṃ |
 Sāvathiyaṃ kule iddhe jāto brāhmaṇajātiyaṃ |
 āsiṃ dhammaruci nāma sabbapāpajigucchako |
 disvāhaṃ lokapajjotaṃ jātiyā sattavassiko |
 Mahājetavanaṃ gantvā pabbajiṃ anagāriyaṃ |
 upemi buddhaṃ tikkhattuṃ rattiyaṃ divasassa ca |
 tadā disvā muni āha ciraṃ Dhammaruci ti maṃ |

At that time I was a well-learned young Brahmin by the name of Megha. Hearing the best of prophecies made to Sumedha the great sage, I placed my trust in Sumedha, that abode of compassion; and when that hero renounced the world, I renounced along with him. Restrained in the Pāṭimokkha and in the five senses, living purely I was a hero, mindful, acting according to the teachings of the Victor. Living thus I was incited by a certain bad friend into misconduct, and I lost the good path. Being under the influence of dubious reasoning, I left the order. Later, due to that bad friend I brought about the murder of my mother. I committed a sin of immediate retribution, and I carried out a murder with evil intentions. Having died, I went and was born in the great Avīci hell, where I stayed for a long while. And being fallen into evil destinies, I transmigrated in pain for a long time. I did not see the hero Sumedha again, that bull among men.

In this æon I was a fish in the sea, Timiṅgala. Seeing a boat on the ocean, I approached it in search of food. Seeing me, the merchants were fearful, and they mindfully called upon (*anusiṃsā*) the best of Buddhas. Hearing the great cry “Gotama!” they shouted, and remembering my former inclinations, I died. I was born as a brahmin in a wealthy household in Sāvathī. I was called Dhammaruci and was one who hated all evil. Seeing the lamp of the world [the Buddha] at the age of seven, I went to the great

Jetavana and renounced the world into the homeless state. I approached the Buddha during the three times of the day and of the night, and each time he saw me the Sage said to me: “It’s been a long time, Dhammaruci.”

This story, although sparse on details, is closely related not only to a parallel in the *Mahāvastu*, but to other accounts of an individual named Dhammaruci, chief among them the Dhammaruci-avadāna in the *Divyāvadāna*. In these other sources we learn that the crimes of this Dhammaruci include the murder of both his parents and of an arhat. I have argued in detail in a recent book that this story, and perhaps particularly the version preserved in the *Divyāvadāna*, served as the prototype for the *Mahāvibhāṣā*’s story of the Ēdipal Mahādeva, held responsible by the Sarvāstivādins for the schism between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas.³⁹ Although it is not possible to detail all the evidence here, there is in my opinion a direct link between the story of an evil Dhammaruci and the schismatic Mahādeva blamed for the rupture which split the Buddha’s previously unitary saṃgha.

The *Mahāvibhāṣā*, I have suggested, did not simply invent the tale of sex and violence which it tells, albeit briefly, about its anti-hero. Instead, it borrowed an already existing story. The direct source of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* can probably never be known,⁴⁰ but I have argued that its archetype either was, or looked very similar to, the story of Dhammaruci, told in or alluded to in many places. But of course, it is not Dhammaruci who is the schismatic, but Mahādeva.

As has been shown very clearly, the name Mahādeva is to be associated historically not with the schism between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas but rather with a later intra-Mahāsāṃghika schism which gave rise to the sub-sect of the Caityaśailas. The story was only later conflated by Sthavira authors with accounts of the fundamental Mahāsāṃghika–Sthavira schism, some authors preserving the older version. For the Indian Buddhist doxographer Vasumitra, for instance, Mahā-

³⁹Silk 2008, esp. chapter 12.

⁴⁰See Silk, forthcoming.

deva is responsible for the emergence of the three sub-sects of the Caityakas, Aparasailas and Uttarasailas,⁴¹ for the Tibetan historian of Indian Buddhism Tāranātha the Caityakas and Pūrvasailas are followers of Mahādeva,⁴² and for the Theravāda Kathāvatthu commentary the Five Theses (without mention of any Mahādeva) are connected with other sub-sects of the Mahāsāṃghikas, the Pubbaseliyas and the Aparaseliyas, who are likewise Andhakas, those from Āndhra.⁴³ Therefore, the origins of the story of the schismatic Mahādeva are connected with a southerly tradition, very probably located in the region of Āndhra. We should remember this when we return to the Dhammarucikas.

While I have been talking about a confusion of schisms, one between Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas and another within the Mahāsāṃghika itself, it is also important to recognize the existence of multiple Mahādevas, as noted by Kern. In addition to the Mahādeva we know from the Mahāvibhāṣā of the Sarvāstivāda tradition, according to Ceylonese “historical” accounts such as the Dīpavaṃsa (Lineage [of Buddhism] on the Island [of Ceylon]) and Mahāvaṃsa (Great Lineage),⁴⁴ Mahādeva was the name of the monk who gave ordination to Mahinda, the missionary who went on to proselytize Ceylon in the third century BCE and alleged to have been the son of the emperor Aśoka.⁴⁵ According to these accounts, Mahādeva himself was sent to

⁴¹See T. 2032: 18a17–20; T. 2033: 20b2–4; T. 2031: 15b1–4. See Lamotte 1956: 157.

⁴²See Schiefner 1868: 208.4–5, and Tāranātha 1985: 217a4: *mchod rten pa dang shar gyi ri pa yang sde gcig cing | de ni kun tu rgyu lha chen po zhes bya ba'i slob ma'o* ||. A translation is found in Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 341.

⁴³See Lamotte 1956: 158, and in more detail Aung and Rhys Davids 1915: xliii, 111, with reference to the commentary on Kathāvatthu II.1–6.

⁴⁴Dīpavaṃsa: VIII.5, trans. p. 159; Mahāvaṃsa: XII.3, 29, trans. pp. 82, 84; Samantapāsādikā in Jayawickrama 1962: 59 (§66), trans. p. 184.

⁴⁵For some considerations concerning the legends surrounding Mahinda, see Yamazaki 1982, although not all his conclusions are to be accepted.

proselytize in Mahisamaṇḍala, a place almost certainly to be identified with Āndhra.⁴⁶ Whether or not this legend has anything of the historical about it, the tradition of an association of this missionary Mahādeva with Āndhra is, once again, noteworthy.⁴⁷

In the context of identifying the name Mahādeva with the south, we should also notice a most peculiar passage, cast in the form of a prediction or prophecy, in the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā (Questions of Śāriputra), a text extant only in Chinese and generally considered to belong to the Mahāsāṃghika school.⁴⁸

As for the Mahāsāṃghika school, two hundred years after my death, as a result of differences of opinion there will arise the Vyavahāra school, Lokottara school, Kukkula school, Bahuśrutaka school, and Prajñaptivāda school. Three hundred years [after my death], as a result of differences in doctrine there will, in addition to these five schools, also arise a Mahādeva school, *Cetāla school, and *Uttari school, and in this fashion these multiple groups will continue on for a long time to come.

⁴⁶Despite alternative theories, the point has been strongly argued by Yamazaki 1979: 138–41, and see Demiéville 1951: 265, n. 1. Cp. Lamotte 1958: 311–12.

⁴⁷See Yamazaki 1979: 138–143 and 1982.

⁴⁸*Shelifuwen jing* 舍利弗問經 (*Śāriputrapariṣcchā), T. 1465 (XXIV) 900c6–11: 摩訶僧祇部。我滅度時，二百年中，因於異論，生起：峭婆訶羅部·盧迦尉多羅部·拘拘羅部·婆収婁多柯部·鉢軻若帝婆耶那部。三百年中，因諸異學，於此五部，復生：摩訶提婆部·質多羅部·末多利部。如是衆多久後流傳。 For the ascription to the Mahāsāṃghikas, see for instance Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 in Ono 1932–1935: 4.376a, and Sasaki 1998: 25 (and on the association Demiéville 1951: 269n.). According to Hirakawa 1970: 270–271, there is little question that the text is a genuine translation of an Indian original. I do not well understand the suggestion of Bareau 1955: 17 that the text, while a Mahāsāṃghika work, belongs to the Kashmira tradition (“Le Çāriputrapariṣcchāsūtra est un ouvrage d’origine mahāsāṃghika, mais qui appartient bien à la tradition cachemirienne ...”), a conclusion which he appears to draw solely on the basis of the similarity of the text’s enumeration with that in the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*.

It is reasonably clear that *Cetāla here should be understood as equivalent to Caityaka, and that *Uttari is the same as Uttaraśaila. This suggests that in this context the “Mahādeva school” should be understood as equivalent to either Pūrvaśaila,⁴⁹ or Aparāśaila, assuming that this account may be forced into a structure parallel to that derived from what other sources tell us of the organization of these sub-sects of the Mahāsāṃghika.⁵⁰ It is remarkable to find here, in what seems to be a Mahāsāṃghika text, what can hardly be other than an explicit identification of one of the Andhaka sects with (some) Mahādeva.⁵¹

⁴⁹See Bareau 1955: 19, and Tsukamoto 1980: 242n5; also Lamotte 1958: 310, 588.

⁵⁰See Appendix II.

⁵¹Although a careful consideration of the entire text of the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā is, in the very first place, a sine qua non for further research, even if the Mahāsāṃghika identification of the scripture can be maintained, and even if the reliability of the translation can be determined, one might then object that the use by a Mahāsāṃghika author of such an appellation, on the one hand, is difficult to harmonize with the hypothesis of an intentional calumnious application of the story of Mahādeva to the Mahāsāṃghikas on the other. However, even setting aside the questionable legitimacy of connecting this schismatic monk Mahādeva with the missionary Mahādeva of Aśokan times, and accepting the identification of the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā’s Mahādeva with that of our stories, it would nevertheless in no way necessarily contradict our suggestions for there to have actually been, within some Andhaka community, an individual monk named Mahādeva who set forth Mahāsāṃghika ideas, perhaps even the very Five Theses. These ideas, in this intra-Mahāsāṃghika context, may not have been at all objectionable to the authors of the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā. We might even imagine that it may have been in response to precisely this acceptance, and the danger they were felt to pose, that opponents of these ideas attached to the (in this scenario, real) name Mahādeva the (quite fictitious) calumnious tale of incest and murder we now know. In this case, the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā would preserve a trace of the original setting of this locally influential figure, direct and unprejudiced reference to whom has apparently been otherwise lost.

The southern connections of Mahādeva and his tale are provocative, and given the association between matricide and the figure of Dhammaruci in the Apadāna, not to mention the broader associations in closely related literature, bring us back to the linkage between the name Dhammaruci and accusations of heresy in Ceylonese Buddhist history. Is it not possible that critics of the Abhayagiri calumniated adherents of the latter by attaching to them a name notoriously associated with improper behavior? As attractive as this might seem, not all the evidence supports such a hypothesis.

Ceylonese epigraphical sources record the name Dhammaruci Nikāya, clearly in contexts favorable to this group, making certain the actual existence of an order by that name.⁵² Thus, it is impossible to suppose that the Mahāvihāran opponents of the Abhayagiri-vihāra merely attached to their enemies the intentionally caluminous name “Dhammarucika”, but that they called themselves something different. It may well be that Kern, after all, is right to suggest that the name Dhammarucika is to be understood literally, at least as a self-designation, indicating “those who take pleasure in the Teaching”.⁵³ Is it consequently impossible to imagine that the opponents of these Dhammarucikas nevertheless in some fashion intended to evoke, in their attacks, some of the calumnious mythology associating the name Dhammaruci with misconduct or even heresy, if not with evil itself?

⁵²The most reliable observations in this regard may be those in Gunawardana 1979; see his index, s.v. Dhammaruci.

⁵³Kern 1881–1883: II.337n5; Bareau 1955: 242, and see Gunawardana 1979: 16. Of course, the name Dharmaruci is also used in an entirely positive way; for instance, it was the original monastic name of the monk who later became, and is better known as, Bodhiruci, the great Zhou/Tang (late seventh- / early eighth-century) translator and compiler of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection. Although often transcribed in Chinese, when translated the name is rendered Faxi 法希 or Fale 法樂, meaning “desirous of the Dharma” and “taking pleasure in the Dharma”, respectively. Another earlier (sixth-century) Dharmaruci (also Faxi) is mentioned in the Xu Gaoseng zhuan 續高僧傳 (T. 2060 [L] 429b29–c1) as translator of an Indian astronomical text.

The intricate connections among the name Dharmaruci, the Vajjiputtakas, the Mahāsāṃghikas, Mahādeva and Āndhra suggest an environment in which such an association, affective rather than concrete, was indeed possible. Even if the materials are not sufficient to convince a skeptic, it must remain a remarkable coincidence that Ceylonese Buddhist traditions of the Mahāvihāra *happen* to attribute immoral behaviors to those, the Dhammarucikas, who share a name with a well-known (Edipal) criminal, Dharmaruci, whose story is so intimately linked with the schismatic par excellence, Mahādeva.

I began by alluding to the synchronicity of the publication of Kern's *Manual of Indian Buddhism* and the birth of Miss Horner in 1896. While I accept, with some regret, the conclusion that there is nothing at all to be made of the co-occurrence of this pair of events, I wonder if the lives of the two giants might nevertheless help us to understand something of what we should expect of ourselves. While one can hardly imagine I. B. Horner making the kind of argument — if one can even call it that — that I offer here, I flatter myself to think that Kern may have found it agreeable. Both Hendrik Kern and I. B. Horner were clearly concerned to determine the meanings of texts, to discover the thoughts and beliefs of those who lived long ago, and committed to doing so through rigorous philological method. They belonged respectively to different ages, and those ages are again different from our own. Part of our task must be to determine what we can and must take from them, and where we must move forward on our own. Both are necessary, I think: to learn and adopt and to learn and reject. I would suggest, although it is far too facile a summation, that we must adopt both the models of philological rigor and sobriety of judgment, and those of playful and creative, even daring, imagination, if we are to aspire to follow in their footsteps.

Jonathan A. Silk
 Instituut Kern, Universiteit Leiden

APPENDIX I: THE APADĀNA

For the text of the Apadāna story cited and translated above see Müller 1895, esp. 169, and in detail in 1896. The Dhammaruci story is found in the Apadāna as number 486 in the Pali Text Society edition, in Kashyap 1959 as number 489 = 49.9 = verses 164–89 (pp. 66–67). The printed texts of the Apadāna are famously bad. I have consulted the PTS edition (edited by Mary Lilley 1927: 429–431); Kashyap 1959; Müller 1896: 55–56; and the Burmese Sixth Council Edition, Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganthamālā 58 (Dhammagiri, Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1998). I translate what I consider to be a reliable text, but have not taken into account the multiple variants, which may or may not actually reflect real manuscript traditions. A partial translation of this episode is found in Lamotte 1944–1980: 1.411–12, and a complete version in Matsumura 2010. I am grateful to the latter which allowed me to correct several errors in my translation. The later Apadāna commentary Visuddhajanavilāsinī also refers to the tale; see Godakumbura 1954: 489.1–14, and the slightly different readings in Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganthamālā 65 (Dhammagiri, Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1998): 209–10.

I omit the beginning of the Apadāna text, which runs:

yadā Dīpaṅkarao buddho Sumedham vyākari jino |
 aparimeyye* ito kappe ayaṃ buddho bhavissati |
 imassa janikā mātā Māyā nāma bhavissati |
 pitā Suddhodano nāma ayaṃ hessati Gotamo |
 padhānaṃ padahitvāna katvā dukkarakārikam |
 assatthamūle sambuddho bujjhissati mahāyaso |
 Upatisso Kolito ca aggā hessanti sāvakā |
 Ānando nāma nāmena upaṭṭhissat’ imaṃ jinaṃ |
 Khemā Uppalavaṇṇā ca aggā hessanti sāvikā |
 Citto Āḷavako c’ eva aggā hessant’ upāsakā |
 Khujjuttarā Nandamātā aggā hessant’ upāsikā |
 bodhi imassa vīrassa assattho ti pavuccati |
 idaṃ sutvāna vacanaṃ asamassa mahesino |
 āmoditā naramarū namassanti katañjalī |

*This form is often found in the Apadāna, and in the Buddhavaṃsa, in this set phrase. However, it is unmetrical, and should perhaps be read *appameyye*. Given the metrical factors, perhaps CPD is wrong to say s.v. *aparimeyya* that it is equivalent to Sanskrit *aparimeya*; probably it is equivalent to *aprameya*.

APPENDIX II: MAHĀSĀMĠHIKA SUBDIVISIONS

The identification of the names of three subdivisions of the Mahāśāṃghika sect: *móhētípó-bù* 摩訶提婆部, *zhíduōluó-bù* 質多羅部, and *mòduōlì-bù* 末多利部, in the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā has occasioned some discussion. The best consideration seems to me now to be that of Tsukamoto 1985: 59–60, in particular with regard to his comments on the last item.

The first name can without hesitation be identified as Mahādeva, although the significance of it here is not completely clear. The second name likewise is relatively clear. Phonetically *zhíduōluó* 質多羅部 may be reconstructed (after Schuessler 2009) as *tšjet-tā-lā*. Tsukamoto has drawn attention to the Prakrit adjectival suffix *-āla* (Pischel 1900: § 595), which is probably involved here. Tsukamoto suggested *tšjet-tā-lā* = **cetira* < *cetia* < *cetiya*, equivalent to Sanskrit *caitya*. But we may have to do with something closer to **cettāla*. In the end Tsukamoto's **Cetāla* may be accepted provisionally.

Regarding the third item, *mòduōlì* 末多利部, Bareau (1955: 17, 19) had understood it as Matarīya, which he identified with hesitation with Uttaraśaila. Lamotte (1958: 310) had in one place taken it without note as Uttaraśaila, and elsewhere (p. 588) as Matara, but identified with the same Uttaraśailas. While neither Matarīya nor Matara are otherwise attested, both of these ideas were at first followed uncritically by Tsukamoto (1980: 242n5; 422, 438; 464), without further consideration, although the connection between the transcription and the Indic name remained unexplained. In Middle Chinese the characters yield *mwāt-tā-li*, which for long seemed obscure. In 1985, however, Tsukamoto made the excellent suggestion that the apparent and anomalous initial *m-* is to be understood as a sandhi consonant inserted in the sequence **cetāla-m-uttariya*, but evidently not understood as such by the Chinese translators (here, rather “transcribers”). Therefore, in the sequence which appears as *mwāt-tā-li* the actual initial of the final term must be not *m-*, but rather the labial *wā*. Thus we arrive at a transcription reconstructible as something like **uttari*, to which **Uttari(ya)* may well correspond, an easy equivalent for the otherwise attested Uttaraśaila, to be taken in the sense of “the northerners”, equivalent to “those who dwell on the northern mountain”. Therefore, while the identifications of earlier scholars such as Bareau and Lamotte may be accepted, a convincing rationale for the identification of the transcription may at last be provided.

It hardly needs stating that, despite these proposals, the first task to be undertaken here in order to try to confirm (or refute) these ideas is a comprehensive study of all transcriptions in the *Śāriputrapariṣcchā, with the aim of attempting to determine something of the possible phonological system behind

them. For the present, however, I remain largely satisfied with the creative suggestions of Tsukamoto in this regard.

LITERATURE

- Adikaram, E. W. 1946. *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon: or "State of Buddhism in Ceylon as Revealed by the Pāli Commentaries of the 5th Century A.D."* (Reprint: Columbo: M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1953).
- Aung, Shwe Zan, and C[aroline] A[ugusta] F[oley] Rhys Davids. 1915. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse, being a translation of the Kathāvatthu from the Abhidhamma-piṭaka*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 5 (Reprint: Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1993).
- Ayerton, E. R. 1924. "The Elephant Stables or Ratana Pāsāda". In A.M. Holcart, ed., *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon*, Vol. 1 (Colombo: A. C. Richards): 1–17.
- Bareau, André. 1955. *Les Sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*. Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 38 (Saigon: École française d'Extrême-Orient).
- Barth, Auguste. 1917. *Œuvres de Auguste Barth; recueillies à l'occasion de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire III* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).
- Baruch, Willy. 1938. *Beiträge zum Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Chimpa, Lama, and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. 1980. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India* (Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi & Company).
- Crosby, Kate. 1999. "History versus Modern Myth: The Abhayagirivihāra, the Vimuttimagga and Yogāvacara Meditation". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27/6: 503–50.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1951. "A Propos du Concile de Vaiśālī". *T'oung Pao* 40/4–5: 239–96.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Fernando, C.M. 1908. *The Nikāya Sangrahawa: Being a History of Buddhism in India and Ceylon*. Revised by W.F. Gunawardhana (Columbo: H.C. Cottle).
- Geiger, Wilhelm Ludwig. 1908. *The Mahāvamsa* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1958).
- . 1912. *The Mahāvamsa or The Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 3 (London: The Pali Text Society).

- . 1929. *Cūḷavaṃsa, Being the More Recent Part of the Mahāvamsa*. Translated from the German by C. Mabel Rickmers (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1973).
- Godakumbura, C[harles] E[dmund]. 1954. *Visuddhajanavilāsinī, Apadāna Commentary* (London: Pali Text Society).
- Gunawardana, R. A. L. H. 1979. *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. The Association for Asian Studies: Monographs and Papers 35 (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press).
- Hanisch, Albrecht. 2005. *Āryaśūras Jātakamālā: Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Legenden 1 bis 15*. Indica et Tibetica 43 (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).
- ’t Hart, Hanna. 1989. “Imagine Leiden without Kern”. In Willem Otterspeer, ed., *Leiden Oriental Connections 1850–1940*. Studies in the History of Leiden University 5 (Leiden: E. J. Brill): 126–40.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1970. *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū 律蔵の研究* (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房).
- Jayawickrama, N. A. 1962. *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna: Being a Translation and Edition of the Bāhiraṇidāna of Buddhaghosa’s Samantapāsādikā, the Vinaya Commentary* (London: The Pali Text Society).
- de Jong, J.W. 1997. *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kosei Publishing).
- Kashyap, Bhikkhu J. 1959. *Khuddakanikāya VII: The Apadāna (II)- Buddhavaṃsa-Caryāpiṭaka*. Nālandā Devanāgarī Pāli Series (Nalanda: Pali Publication Board).
- Kern, Johan Hendrik Caspar. 1865. *The Br̥hat Saṅhitā of Varāha-Mihira*. Bibliotheca Indica 48 (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press).
- . 1868–1878. “Die Yogayātrā des Varāhamihira”. *Indische Studien* 10 (1868): 161–212, 14 (1876): 312–58, 15 (1878) 167–85, reprinted in *Verspreide Geschriften* [’s-Gravenhage, 1913–1929] I.99–168.
- . 1870–1875. “The Br̥hat-Saṅhitā; or, Complete System of Natural Astrology of Varāha-mihira. Translated from Sanskrit into English”. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 4 (1870): 430–79, 5 (1871): 45–90, 231–88, 6 (1873): 36–91, 279–338, 7 (1875): 81–134 (reprinted in *Verspreide Geschriften*: I.169–319, II.1–154).

- . 1873. “Over de Jaartelling der zuidelijke Buddhisten en de Gedenkstukken van Açoka den Buddhist”. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks VIII (1873): 1–120.
- . 1874a. *The Āryabhaṭīya, a manual of astronomy, with the Commentary Bhaṭadīpikā of Paramādīçvara* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).
- . 1874b. “Prof. H. Kern’s Dissertation on the Era of Buddha and the Aśoka Inscriptions”. Trans. J. Muir. *Indian Antiquary* 3: 77–81.
- . 1876. “Professor Kern’s Versions of Some of the Aśoka Inscriptions”. Trans. Adam Milroy. *Indian Antiquary* 5: 257–76.
- . 1877. “The Inscriptions of Junnar”. Trans. M. Tweedie. *Indian Antiquary* 6: 39–41.
- . 1880. “On the Separate Edicts at Dhauri and Jaugada”. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (new series) 12/3: 379–94.
- . 1881–1883 [1882–1884?]. *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië* (Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman; Tjeenk Willink, 1882 and 1884).
- . 1881–1883a. “Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l’Inde”. *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 4 (1881): 149–65, 5 (1882): 49–88, 145–226, 7 (1883): 17–62.
- . 1882–1884. *Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien: eine Darstellung der Lehren und Geschichte der buddhistischen Kirche*. Trans. Hermann Jacobi (Leipzig: Schulze).
- . 1884. *The Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law*. The Sacred Books of the East 21 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- . 1886. “Bijdrage tot de verklaring van eenige woorden in Pāli-geschriften voorkomende”. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller. Originally in the *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks XVII.1.
- . 1891. *The Jātaka-Mālā, or Bodhisattvāvadāna-mālā by Ārya-Çūra*. Harvard Oriental Series 1 (Boston, MA: Ginn & Company, for Harvard University).
- . 1896. *Manual of Indian Buddhism*. Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 3.8 (Strassburg: Trübner).
- . 1901–1903. *Histoire du bouddhisme dans l’Inde*. Trans. Gédéon Busken Huet. *Annales du Musée Guimet* 10, 11 (Paris: Leroux).
- . 1906. “Sur l’Invocation d’une Inscription bouddhique de Battambang”. Trans. Louis de la Vallée Poussin. *Le Muséon* (new series) 7: 46–66.
- . 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St.-Petersbourg: Imprimerie de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences).

- . 1914. *Kerun-shi Bukkyō Taikō* ケルン氏佛教大綱. Trans. Tachibana Shundō 立花俊道 (Tokyo : Tōadō shobo 東亜堂書房).
- . 1916. “Toevoegselen op ’t woordenboek van Childers”. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller. Originally in the *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks XVI.4 & 5.
- Khoroché, Peter. 1987. *Towards a New Edition of Ārya-Śūra’s Jātakamālā*. Indica et Tibetica 12 (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1944–1980. *Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24 (Reprint: Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1970–1981).
- . 1956. “Buddhist Controversy over the Five Propositions”. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 32/2–3: 148–62.
- . 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien, des origines à l’ère Śaka*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 43 (Reprint: Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 14. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1976).
- Lüders, H. 1916. “Miscellaneous Fragments”. In August Friedrich Rudolf Hoernle, ed., *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford).
- Malalasekera, George Peiris [Gunapala Piyasena]. 1935. *Vamsatthappakāsinī, Commentary on the Mahāvamsa* (London: Pali Text Society).
- . 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: Pali Text Society).
- Matsumura, Junko. 2010. “The Sumedhakathā in Pāli Literature and Its Relation to the Northern Buddhist Textual Tradition”. *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 14: 101–33.
- Mori, Sodō. 1999. *Mahāyāna Buddhism in Sri Lanka* (Nisshin-shi, Japan: Sodō Mori).
- Müller[-Hess], Édouard. 1895. “Les Apadānas du Sud”. *Actes du Dixième Congrès International des Orientalistes, Session de Genève 1894, Part 2* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 165–73.
- . 1896. “Die Legende von Dīpaṅkara und Sumedha”. *Gurupūjākaumudī, Festgabe zum fünfzigjährigen Doktorjubiläum Albrecht Weber* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz): 54–58.
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. 1990. *The Work of Culture: Symbolic Transformations in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1879. *The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record* (Reprint: New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1982).

- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1932–1935. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典 (Tokyo : Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社).
- Pischel, Richard. 1900. *A Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. Trans. Subhadra Jhā [English : Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1981].
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1998. “Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (7) : The Vibhāṣā and the Śāriputrapariṣcchā”. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 27 : 1–55.
- Schiefner, Antonius [Franz Anton von]. 1868. *Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione*. Narratio. Contextum Tibeticum (Petrograd : Imp. Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae).
- Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu : University of Hawai‘i Press).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. *Riven by Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography* (Honolulu : University of Hawai‘i Press).
- . Forthcoming. “Two Mahādeva Fragments”. To appear in J. Braarvig et al., eds., *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 4. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection (Oslo : Hermes Publishing).
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1893–1894. “Jātakamālā (Garland of Birth Stories)”. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 42 [VIII] (1893) : 129–82; 254–310, 441–500; 43 [X] (1894) : 201–56; 321–85; 616–58.
- . 1895. *The Gātakamālā or Garland of Birth-Stories by Āryasūra*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 1 (London : Oxford University Press).
- Tāranātha. 1985. *The Collected Works of Jo-nañ Rje-btsun Tāranātha*. Smanrtsis shesrig dpemzod 16 (Leh, Ladakh : C. Namgyal & Tsewang Taru).
- Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥. 1980. *Shoki Bukkyō Kyōdanshi no Kenkyū* 初期仏教教団史の研究 (Tokyo : Sankibō Busshorin).
- . 1985. “Andakaryū no keisei to tenkai (sono ichi) : Seitasanbu no seiritsu” アンダカ流の形成と展開 [その一] 一制多山部の成立 [The formation and development of the Andhaka schools 1 : The Caityakas]. In Mibu Taishun Hakase Juju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 壬生台舜博士頌寿記念論文 集刊行会, ed., *Mibu Taishun Hakase Juju Kinen : Bukkyō no Rekishi to Shisō* 壬生台舜博士頌寿記念仏教の歴史と思想 [Tokyo : Daizō shuppan 大藏出版] : 57–76.
- Turnour, George. 1836. *An Epitome of the History of Ceylon Compiled from Native Annals, and the First Twenty Chapters of the Mahawanso* (Ceylon : Cotta Church Missionary Press).

- Vetter, Tilmann. 1999. "Hendrik Kern and the Lotussūtra". *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 / *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 2: 1–13.
- Yamazaki Gen'ichi 山崎元一. 1979. *Ashōkaō Densetsu no Kenkyū* アシヨーカ王伝説の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1982. "The Spread of Buddhism in the Mauryan Age: With Special Reference to the Mahinda Legend". *Acta Asiatica* 43: 1–16.